

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

MARIUS H. ROBINSON, Editor.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, Publishing Agent.

VOL. 8---NO. 38.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO, JUNE 11, 1853.

WHOLE NO 402.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, O.
TERMS.—\$1.50 per annum if paid in advance
\$2.00 per annum, if payment be delayed be-
yond the year.

We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-slavery truth, with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves, or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to MARIUS H. ROBINSON, Editor. All others to ANN PEARSON, Publishing Ag't.

J. HUDSON, PRINTER.

THE BUGLE.

"Honoring God."

Henry Ward Beecher, in his speech before the American Anti-Slavery Society, has the following strange declaration, in the midst of some most brilliant and excellent remarks:

"My earnest desire is that Slavery may be destroyed by the manifest power of Christianity. If it were given me to choose whether it should be destroyed in fifty years by selfish commercial influence, or standing for seventy-five years, by the spirit and trophy of Christ, I had rather let it linger twenty-five years more, that God may be honored and not man, in the destruction of it."

What a horrible sentiment! and of a truth what a "jealous God" must he be, who would "rather" our millions of slaves, with their untold ignorance, wretchedness and wrong—the masters with their uncomprehended guilt and oppression, should continue for a quarter of a century, that God, and not men, should have the "honor" of its abolition. We know of no revelation of God in all his government,—in all the works of his hands which teach such a doctrine. They all teach otherwise. Were the spirit of "commercial selfishness" to abolish slavery to-day, does Mr. Beecher, even, think that the Governor of the Universe would, out of jealousy, paralyze the laws of human existence, and quench the new-born energy, industry and enterprise which liberty has always imported to the emancipated slave? Would it be another the outlasting emotions of joy which the mother would feel, that her babe was now her own—that slave auctions and separations were henceforth to be unknown? No, in these and a hundred other ways, God would speak out his approbation that even "commercial selfishness" had, for its own sake, removed this form of evil. The motives which Kossuth proposed to use with Austria, were no better than "commercial selfishness," and yet Mr. Beecher gave Kossuth his pulpit and his influence that he might emancipate the Hungarians by terror and the sword. Mr. Beecher did not propose to Kossuth, as we ever heard, to wait 25 years that God might emancipate his countrymen by Christianity and take the honor to himself. By the heartless Christianity of this country, emancipation is not the work of twenty-five years. Eternity would be too short for it. We are sorry to see Mr. Beecher's theology, (not to say his Christianity,) putting off thus the day of Redemption.

The Tribune comments upon this as follows:

"Now, so far as this passage indicates a preference that the abolition of slavery should be impelled by Principle rather than Interest, Philanthropy rather than Selfishness, Christianity rather than Mammon, we heartily agree with it; but if we were required to decide whether Slavery should cease in 1850, through selfish and secular influence, or in 1855, through the influence of Christianity, we should hesitate, ponder, and wish to take the sense of those in bondage, before agreeing to the twenty-five years, postponement for the glory of Christianity. If they were willing to endure the lash, the cattle and the auction-block for another generation—to have more infants sold from the mothers' breasts and daughters marketed for shame—till 1855, in order that Christianity might reap the glory of its overthrow, why then we would think about it. Nay, we would still wish to interrogate Christianity herself, and learn whether she would prefer to have the abominations and cruelties inseparable from the ownership of man by man, continue a quarter of a century, in order that its overthrow might redound to her own glory. If she would, our estimate of her character would be somewhat lower than it has been. Most certainly the Parable of the Good Samaritan would not have been improved by a supplementary regret that the man who fell among thieves had not lain half a day longer until some Priest or Levite would have come along who would have had compassion on him."

PRETTY CONCLUSIVE.—The N. Y. National Democrat speaking of the position of the Hunters and Barnburners of that State, says, "We must become abolitionists or they must give up abolitionism, or we must separate forever. That is about what the boy said when he fell into the river—he must either swim out, drown, or stay in and float.—*Lowell American.*"

A national convention of the colored people will be held at Rochester, N. Y., July 6th.

Universalists and Slavery.

FRIEND ROBINSON:—As the relations of the American Church to slavery have always been a subject of patient and earnest investigation with abolitionists, and as, so far as I know, their only desire is to ascertain the exact truth in regard to it, I thought I would write a short article with reference to that branch the name of which I have mentioned above, and with which I was for several years in connection.

Owing to the smallness of the Universalist denomination, when compared with the Evangelical sects, its action and position on the subject of slavery are not as generally and fully understood as theirs. But it is, nevertheless, so far as its church rules and action are concerned, as pro-slavery as any of them. I do not say that there are as many pro-slavery individuals in the sect, in proportion to the whole, as there are in some others; I do not think that there are. I speak of its organic action and position. Many of the branches of the sect, particularly in the N. E. States, have taken quite stringent action against slavery, but none, so far as I know, have ever taken the ground that pro-slavery or slaveholding is sufficient immoral to be a bar to church fellowship. And all these branches are in immediate connection and fellowship with slaveholders through their General Convention. The ecclesiastical organization of Universalists is composed of a General Convention, State Conventions, Associations and Societies or Churches. The General Convention is made up of delegates from the State Conventions; these, of delegates from the Associations; and these, of delegates from the Societies. There are Conventions in many of the Slave States; Va., S. C., Ky., and others, and there is nothing to hinder slaveholders from those States sitting in the General Convention in full fellowship. True, this Convention has in times past, resolved that slavery is wrong, and some years since, it prepared a protest against the slave system for its ministers to sign, in which slavery was called by its right name, and the result was that not more than of the whole number of ministers signed it, and many refused and unblushingly endeavored to justify the institution. But they are just as good; they are "faithful and beloved" brethren for all that! Many of them have not been exceeded by Dr. Dewey in expressing devotion to the Union, and in preaching obedience to the infernal "fugitive bill."

At the same time, there are a goodly number who have faithfully stood by God's "higher law" in their pulpits, though giving the hand of ecclesiastical fellowship to its deniers and defamers, the authors and supporters of the lowest of all lower laws, the "bill" aforesaid. Three years ago the General Convention invited Dr. Clapp of New Orleans to deliver its "occasional sermon," notwithstanding his bold defence of slavery as a Christian institution. It is but a short time since he declared in substance, in a thanksgiving sermon that slaveholders should hold on to their slaves as a Christian duty, and yet the denunciations and flatters him as a dear brother, though he is not in formal fellowship. When I connected myself with the denomination, I supposed it anti-slavery, because it professed to glorify the doctrine of Universal Brotherhood. At the first opportunity, I sought to get some (rather milk and water, I confess) anti-slavery resolutions before the Convention of this State, but the Business Committee, to whom they were entrusted forgot them they said. At two subsequent times I endeavored to get the Association (composed of Cuyahoga, Lorain and Medina counties), to take some action condemnatory of slavery, but my resolutions were laid upon the table. I thought it inconsistent to longer continue in fellowship, and so withdrew. Whenever I join a church again, its anti-slavery will not be a matter of inference but of positive knowledge.

Yours for truth,

J. W. TOWNER.

Letter from W. Pennsylvania.

CRAWFORD COUNTY, PA.,
May 20th, 1853.

TO MY FRIEND, MARIUS H. ROBINSON: I will take this opportunity to make a statement in regard to the progress of the Anti-Slavery sentiment which has been going on in our vicinity for the last few months. We were visited a few months since by our friends, Charles and Josephine Griffing, who held a number of interesting meetings in our place and vicinity, giving great satisfaction to those who heard, who were by no means a few. Since then, we have been visited by our friend, John F. Selby, who commenced working in the vineyard of the Lord in this vicinity, upon the subject of moral reform. The first sabbath he preached from these words: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against

powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." The crowded audience received the truth he uttered, in good, and we trust in honest hearts. In the afternoon of the same day, he made a few remarks in the school house near where we live, where some of the converts to Baptism, who were converted to that faith during the late six weeks' revival, spent mostly in worshipping their new Church, with their high steeples, which was built strictly for the promulgation of sectarian dogmas, under the direction of a lordly priest, who on the subject of slavery, is more dumb than was Baalam's Ass, to his sense of right. Some of those converts ventured in opposition to the instructions of their leaders, to stop at the outside of the house, to listen to what was being said within, and then in accordance with their revival teachings, left, stating false things of what had been said. Such occurrences however, we trust are not very common.

Our friend Selby visited us again last Sabbath, and gave us six lectures, which we considered of great value to enquiring minds. On Wednesday following, he had a short interview with a Baptist Preacher, at our house, by the name of Cheaney. He appears to be the most thorough going anti-slavery Baptist Preacher I ever saw. They agreed in many important matters. Our friend Cheaney delivered an address on Thursday evening, after the above mentioned interview with Selby, in the Baptist Church in this place, where he spoke with great boldness on the subject of temperance and slavery, in which he denounced the Church in all her pro-slavery actions, both morally and politically, stating that the Church had become in many respects the mother of infidelity. The language of the speaker, seemed to astound the old priest, above alluded to, who sat with mouth open and eyes glaring as it were, in wonder and surprise, to hear such denunciatory remarks from the sacred desk. On being called on to pronounce the parting benediction, it short and feeble accents. We hope it will do him good, as it doth the upright in heart. The sentiments of our community seem to be fast mending. The spirit of truth is beginning to prevail in our midst, sectarianism begins to tremble at its foundation, and we believe is destined to be numbered among the things that were and are not. In all our public meetings, we see resolutions passed and principles adopted, or sentiments advanced in favor of the higher law, and discountenancing the low and dastardly principles of the fugitive slave law, and the accused apologizers for slavery. So we see the principles of anti-slavery and general reform, are becoming the all important subject of these latter days. May the Lord hasten the happy day to favor Zion, when the mountain of slavery shall be dug down, and the valley of the poor and the oppressed and down-trodden, shall be exalted, and raised up to the common level of humanity, and the rough ways of this life shall all be made smooth, then shall one law govern all nations, and that law shall be the law of universal love. We shall then love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and our neighbors as ourselves.

M. BISHOP.

Good Advice.

FRIEND ARIUS: I attended the meetings of Charles and Josephine Griffing, on Saturday night and Sunday last, and feel impelled to say a word of them through the Bugle, for the encouragement of workers in this great Anti-Slavery mission. The meetings were held in a school house, seven miles from Cleveland, in the town of Warrensville, and reminded me strongly of old fashioned Methodist class meetings. I could trace the workings of the Holy Spirit of truth in the countenances of many, while listening to the calm earnest impressive eloquence of our friend Josephine. She seems to make the slave's case her own, and if the people will but give her a hearing, is sure to win from their hearts pity for the poor miserable, degraded, obscured image of God, in the African slave. Our friend Charles, labored most effectively in the cause, following Josephine, with his logic and strong arguments. He "clinches the nail fast," deepens the impression, and points out the most efficient mode of action, which often leads to interesting discussions.

I was much amused at the zeal and heartfelt devotion to the cause, exhibited by one of the farmers of that district. He was an elderly man, and an Englishman of "wealth and standing," as the phrase is. Coming into the meeting while Mr. Griffing was speaking, he knelt down, and seemed offering up a silent prayer for the cause, then rising, listened to the discourse with most

fixed attention. Next morning while sitting in the parlor of our friend Post, waiting for the hour for meeting to arrive, who should present himself but our English friend,—wiping the perspiration from his brow, and taking a glass of cold water, he said he had walked two miles to attend the meeting, and took the liberty to call a few moments, for he wanted to give the friends a little bit of advice. "Keep close to the truth," said he, "and nail yourselves there." "Do as ye did last night," and "first keep Jesus Christ handy, and give it to 'em, dash in the face!" "If there's a conquest to be made, let the woman go ahead," but "keep yer club of truth long side of ye, ready to hit 'em." After the morning lecture he rose, and summed up the whole argument, in his homely, eloquent style, uttering some burning, scathing truths upon the subject, which impressed us deeply. Would there were an army of as clear sighted abolitionists as our English friend, working in the cause. Truly the day of the slave's jubilee would hasten.

Yours for the elevation of Humanity,

M.

N. P. Willis upon Georgia.

In one of Willis's sketches of Southern life and scenery, written during his visit last spring, occurs the following notice of Georgia:

"We were eight hours crossing South Carolina—a disreputable brief traverse, of which I felt quite ashamed on a first visit,—and crossing the Savannah river, we ascended a bank into the State of Georgia. This seemed the beginning of a higher platform of land, a different soil, and surface more uneven and picturesque. Augusta, the town we landed at, looked very New England to my eye. There was a lively air about the people in the streets, plenty of fresh paint on the houses, new signs, bright colored bricks, broad streets with no grass in them, and an unequivocal accustomedness to 'enterprises' in the paces of the cart-horses. The ladies whom we saw shopping looked very fashionably dressed and metropolitan. I saw but one novelty which told of climate and usages different from the North—a very common-looking man strolling along leisurely in his shirt sleeves and gazing into the shop windows. This was the first I had seen, out of London, to the mounted 'tiger' riding behind the dandy 'swell,' with the waterproof overall fastened to his crupper. The dandy footman was dressed in tow-cloth jacket and trousers, and wore a white felt hat with ragged rim—his black skin underneath looking fat, shiny, and comfortable. The curious part of it was to see the quality of the man that could afford to be his master. He was himself hardly as clean and tidy as would be necessary to pass for 'respectable' in a working-man at the North. Most likely he was an eccentric specimen, but there was no misgiving of his authority in the air of his faithful Juba."

There must either be a generally diffused taste for park-scenery in Georgia, or there is some local advantage in thinning out woods, and clearing them of underbrush, which appeals to the common policy of every inhabitant. Woodlands of majestic trees, with open pasture-range beneath, were never out of sight from one side of the State to the other. It was only odd—after seeing these in England as appendages of the ancient family estates, every aisle of tree trunks serving mainly as a note of admiration to some famous names—to see them here doing honor to nobody in particular. Passing through what might be memorial estates of great magnificence, I inquired in vain for the name of the proprietors. Nobody knew whose grandeur and dignity was there waving in the wind and making a half-size imposing. It was like a glorification going to waste."

I was disappointed (traveling, as one does, in a rail car, like a noised letter in an envelope) not to have had the opportunity to see a specific and undoubted specimen of the Georgia "cracker." This is said to be the only customer with whom the Yankee has no chance—a sharper of the South that can out-wood-nutten even a Connecticut pedler. They inhabit the sand-tracks, waste lands, and border settlements, and are usually described as white-headed, yellow-skinned, lean and depraved out of missionary reach. How they come by the sagacity with which they 'squat,' swindle, evade the law, and enjoy an Arab freedom of range, and what is their constituent genealogy, I wish some Andalusian would ornithologize."

Losses of Human Life by War

The last number of the *Companion to the Almanac* contains a curious return, compiled from official sources, of the killed and wounded of the regular British troops in the military and naval actions from 1793 to 1815. The results exhibit a less amount of bloodshed than the popular imagination usually connects with great wars. The total number of killed was 12,736, of whom 1169 were officers. The total number of wounded was 74,359, of whom 9720 were officers. The proportion of killed in the navy as compared with those in the army, is about one fourth; but the wounded were in a much less proportion; a fact which would seem to imply, that the means of destruction are much more effective in the former branch of force. It would manifestly, however, be wrong to speak, in round numbers, of 20,000 lives as the total amount of loss by sea and land during these twenty-two years of war. We know not how many of the wounded never recovered, or had their lives shortened and embittered by the injuries they had sustained. We are also without any means of stating

the number of the missing, or of tracing their fates. It would probably be nearer the truth to speak of 40,000 lives sacrificed by the war. The actions of that warlike period were not of a sanguinary character during the first few years. For example, the loss of men in 1797 was only thirty-eight, three of whom were officers. Even in the year of the arduous campaigns of Sir Ralph Abercrombie in Egypt, the loss was no more than 567 men and twenty-two officers. In the years of the Peninsular campaigns, the numbers increased to 1250 in 1809, which includes the slaughter at Corunna; and 1628 in 1811, which saw the bloody encounters of Barossa, Fuentes de Oñore, and Albuera. The slain of 1813 were nearly 3300. At Waterloo, there fell 171 officers, and 2341 private men, while the wounded were respectively 680, and 9905.

The New England Anti-Slavery Convention.

ABRIDGED, FROM THE LIBERATOR.

The twentieth annual New England Anti-Slavery Convention assembled in the Melodeon, Boston, on Wednesday, May 25, and was called to order at 10 o'clock by FRANCIS JACKSON, President of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

On motion, the following persons were chosen a Committee, to nominate officers for this Convention: Samuel May, Jr., John T. Hilton and John M. Spear.

Prayer was offered by John M. Spear, of Boston.

While the Committee on the organization of the Convention were out, Henry C. Wright asked leave to offer the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That to vote under the Constitution of the United States is to vote for that Constitution, and for every principle and measure therein contained.

Whereas, the Constitution provides (1.) that human beings may be represented as property in the government—(2.) that they may be seized and reduced to slavery on each and every foot of territory over which the government holds jurisdiction—and (3.) that the government may be used to prevent slaves from gaining their liberty by flight or by arms; therefore,

2. Resolved, That all who vote under the Constitution of the United States vote for those provisions in favor of slavery and against liberty.

Whereas, slaveholders are component parts of this confederacy, and have a right to an equal share in its offices, its honors and emblems on the principle that the majority shall rule; therefore,

3. Resolved, That all who vote under the Constitution, vote for the slaveholders' right to obtain that majority, and thus to get the control of the government, and to wield it for the support and perpetuity of slavery to the full extent of what they deem their constitutional power.

4. Resolved, That all such voters, by entering into a political union with slaveholders, virtually pledge themselves to them, that if they do get the control of the government, in a constitutional way, they will not resist the execution of any law they, as the majority, shall see fit to pass in favor of slavery; but that they will obey it, or peacefully submit to any penalty until the majority can be constitutionally changed in favor of liberty.

5. That to assert the Constitution is an anti-slavery document, and that it was not designed and does not intend, in any of its provisions, to secure slaveholders in their right of property in their slaves, is to give the lie to the Convention that formed that instrument; to the uniform decisions of its authorized expounders, the judges of the Supreme Court; to the uniform testimony of the legislative and executive houses of the government, and to the facts of history, so far as they bear on this question.

6. That those who thus construe the Constitution, while they remain in the Union, as parts of its governing power, are guilty of treachery to their slaveholding confederates, inasmuch as these were given to understand that instrument as favoring and securing their rights as slaveholders, and inasmuch as they would not have entered into the confederacy, had they ever thought the Constitution was to receive an anti-slavery construction.

Whereas, in his recent discussion with Wendell Phillips, Horace Mann declares that an oath to support the Constitution is to be received as God, being a party to the oath, sees it to be understood by the person making it; therefore,

7. Resolved, That we enter our earnest protest against such a construction of oaths, as a sanction of the principle of mental reservations.

8. Resolved, That to give our oath to slaveholders, that we will help them execute the Constitution in favor of slavery, provided they, having the majority, shall so interpret it, and then to violate our oath when they actually do get the majority, and do thus construe it, is to swear to do what we have no intention of doing, and thus to commit perjury with intent to deceive.

Mr. Wright spoke at some length in support of these resolutions.

James N. Buffum inquired if Abolitionists and Free Soilers did not stand on precisely the same footing, with regard to agreeing to execute and obey the laws, or suffer the penalty of disobedience.

Mr. Wright replied, that the Free Soiler, by his vote, agrees that the laws and the Constitution shall be executed as the slaveholders wish, if they [the slaveholders] get the majority. The Abolitionist agrees to no such thing, and refuses to become a partner to any such arrangement.

Mr. Davis, of Manchester, N. H., wished to append another resolution to Mr. Wright's series, to the effect that we have no right to live in this country, as we cannot do so without paying taxes &c., and so helping to support the Constitution and Government.

Mr. Wright objected to this, as it related to an entirely different point, and however intended, its effect is to divert attention from the point of the resolutions already offered. Let Mr. D. present his resolution, if he wishes, in an independent and separate form.

Mr. Davis reiterated his former position, and said if Free Soilers were involved, by voting, in the guilt of slavery, Mr. Garrison and his children were equally so, by their use of the post-office, paying taxes &c.

Chas. C. Burleigh, in an able and logical speech, answered the remarks of Mr. Davis. Mr. Burleigh argued the pro-slavery character of the U. S. Constitution and Government.

Rev. David A. Wasson, of Groveland, maintained that, whatever pro-slavery he in the U. S. Constitution, he did not support those evil things to which, by the very conditions of his vote, he was known to be opposed. A free-soil vote, said he, is known every where as a vote against slavery, and the person giving it cannot be understood by any intelligent man as an accomplice with slaveholders. As an illustration of his meaning, Mr. Wasson said, that on entering an omnibus, he might see a notice posted up in it that, as payment for his ride in it, he must not only give the usual sum of money, but must also kiss the driver's toe. He should hold himself under no obligation to do it.

Stephen S. Foster, of Worcester, said he would like to ask two questions of the last speaker—he said, Let me ask the gentleman if, previous to entering the omnibus, we were required to take an oath to kiss the toe of the driver, would he take the oath, provided he did not mean to do the thing? Again, How is it to be known, by the other voters all over the country, what parts of the Constitution the gentleman means to support, and what he does not mean to support?

To the last question, Mr. Wasson said that it must be known, all over the country, that every free-soil vote is a vote against slavery, and against every pro-slavery provision in the Constitution. To the first question, Mr. Wasson it is believed did not reply; if so, it was not understood.

C. Braubach, of Boston, in reply to a remark of Mr. Wasson that the slaveholders feared Horace Mann much more than they did Mr. Garrison, asked what Free Soiler had ever had five thousand dollars offered for his head, as was done in the case of Mr. Garrison by the Legislature of the State of Georgia.

Mr. Garrison argued against the assumption that the ballot is a gift from God, which a man cannot refuse to use. Mr. G. declared that the ballot is a gift from God, which a man is given, relies upon physical force, in the last resort, to execute its purposes. Mr. G. wondered to hear Mr. Wasson exalt so disproportionately the value and power of the ballot, and speaking so slightly of talking, of that weapon, the tongue, upon which apostles and reformers had relied to save the world. Did those men accomplish nothing in their day? Did Jesus, who had no ballot, effect nothing? And the apostles? And Luther and his unfranchised associates? Did not all these men glory in the power which lay in the *freedom of preaching*?

Voted, to refer the resolutions, presented by H. C. Wright, to the Business Committee.

The Committee on organization reported a list of officers, who were unanimously chosen.

Adjourned to the afternoon.

Mr. Henry C. Wright, said the voters were the governing power of the nation, and every man who votes at the polls is bound to uphold the governing power. The Constitution is his bill of instructions to his representatives—the President, the Supreme Court, and Congress. The Constitution tells them within what limits they are to keep, in their official capacity. He did not mean that the Constitution was to be a law of life to the persons, in their private capacity, but that it was a bill of instructions for them to follow in their official capacity. If this construction was set at naught, the very idea of a constitutional government is absurd.

It was stated that each man was to interpret that Constitution according to his own conscience, and then vote only for so much of the Constitution as his conscience approved. Well, his friend gave one set of instructions to his agent,—his conscience allows one thing; Mr. Mann allows another; Mr. Sumner allows another. Each voter gives his own construction of the document, to his agent, and demands that he shall execute his instructions, and no more; if he executes more than his instructions, the voter is not to be held responsible for what his agent does over and above his instructions! This, they would see, annihilates the very idea of constitutional government. Was each individual to interpret it? Was the agent to interpret it for himself alone? Or would they provide the interpreter to decide what the Constitution means, and then hold their agent to abide by it? The latter was the plan this nation had adopted.

Mr. Wasson said, it is a sin, is it a wrong for me to use what powers I can under the Constitution, while I do so under protest against all the evils it tolerates? He did not think it was. Some remarks had been made in reference to "mental reservations." He agreed with the resolutions under discussion, that it was the duty of every man to make his position thoroughly understood. But, having made himself thoroughly understood, he did not see that there was any "mental reservation" in the matter that could be stigmatized as Jesuitical.

He regarded it as a great loss, as a great wrong to give up a power which rightfully belongs to us, and which we exercised against an evil which we abhorred. What right had any one to surrender such a power? Let it not be supposed that the Constitution created that right; it only recognized, and provided a form under which that form should be exercised. The point that he urged was that we were under obligation to use that right,

as long as we could do so without being practically understood, and that if we refused to exercise, we committed a great wrong to ourselves and to our neighbor. To this it was made answer, that the publication of truth is the greatest agency in the world; that Jesus and the Apostles had the tongue alone, that Luther had no ballot. All this was very true; but it remained true also, that in all practical reforms, there was a progressive movement from the era of speaking to the era of doing. It was very well to resort to the tongue at first; but when we have got public opinion on our side, we wanted some means by which that opinion should pass into law, and so we go to the ballot-box.

But the friends on the opposite side said: "No! you must put that agency away!" They throw us back upon the tongue alone. The tongue alone would never emancipate the slaves at the South. The tongue might wage forever, and all to no purpose; but the time must come—and it had come—when the opinion of men must find its way into deeds. And now he asked to be shown why it was that he was to be denied the use of a power for that purpose which he found in his hands, and which was rightfully there?

Again, it said that we had come out from the Whig party, the Democratic party, and the Church, and now it is time to come out from the State. It seemed to him that there was a wide difference here. The parties were purely voluntary and temporary in their character—made for convenience alone; they imply no power whatsoever—give, none take none. The Church, it seemed to him, was of that character; an organization that we need apply not for any powers which we exercise under it, but simply for the moral influence it can exert. If he found that that moral organization was false to its trust, it was his duty to separate himself from it. If he found that the Whig party or the Democratic party did not carry out its principles, he should separate from it, and seek some other organization, with which he could act. But the State was a very different thing. The State was an organization which provided a form for the exercise of powers which we had a right to exercise, and in separating ourselves from the State, we cripple ourselves; we cut off our own hands; we leave ourselves no faculty but that of speech. The question with him was, Had he a right to lay down this power at the feet of men whom he knew would abuse it?

If, then, there was such a distinction as he had set forth—of by tolerating, under protest, a man in a certain position, he cleared himself from all guilt attached to that position—then he was right and no blame attached to him. If he tolerated him, under protest, for the express purpose of putting an end to the wrong, he obeyed his own conscience; where was the wrong? That was his question, now and always.

The Constitution did not create the evil, but only agreed, for a certain time to tolerate it; while it put within our hands the very means for putting it away. He meant to comply with the spirit of that Constitution. He was willing, under a protest which no man could misunderstand, to pass by the evils which belong to the Constitution, casting them off from himself; and he did it for the purpose of voting to amend it, by removing its evil.

Where was the wrong? Yet his friends, in obedience to what he deemed a precedent of conscience, refused to use the power in their hands. If the day should ever come when the vote of Northern freemen might set the slaves free, and his friends should still hold the position they now do, and say: "No! No! I shall be understood to imply consent to Slavery"—might not every slave at the South rise up and say: "Our blood be on your garments." (Cheers.)

C. C. Burleigh, said, that with the force of logic and the force of moral sentiment which his friend had manifested, he only needed to discover one flaw in his premises, in order to stand side by side with them on the ground of "no Union with slaveholders." It seemed to him that the erroneous conclusion to which his friend came was attributable to his want of appreciation of the difference between government, an artificial thing, made by man, and society, a natural outgrowth of human nature. It seemed to him that he (Mr. W.) confounded the distinction between the right to vote in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, and the right to express his opinions and exert his influence, in a natural way, on every subject which concerns human welfare. In his mind, there was a broader and clearer distinction between these two things than between some things which his friend had held up as distinct. He (Mr. B.) denied at the outset that man had a natural right to vote, using that word in its technical sense; using it in its broader sense, he admitted that every man had a right to vote; and in that sense, no more effective vote is ever cast, in its bearing upon the politics and religion of this nation, than that which was cast upon that platform from lips denouncing the Constitution which gave toleration to Slavery, denouncing the government which makes itself the engine of oppression to three millions of our fellow countrymen. Indeed, he did not see the perfect consistency of the preceding speaker, for at one time he told him that his right to vote at the ballot box was not derived from the Constitution, that it belonged to him as a man, as a member of the social organization—belongs to him as one capable of influencing and of being influenced; and then he told him that he (Mr. B.) was guilty of a dereliction of duty because he did not go to the polls and vote under a Constitution which, while it tolerated some evil, gives him a power which he might use for removal of that evil. He believed that he (Mr. W.) stated the exact truth in regard to the source of the power which he conceived he had to use the ballot-box, or which he can have, while the Constitution is recognized as the bond of our political organization.

The government was based upon a far different ground from that upon which the former speaker would place it. No man can be a party to any government unless he consents to the conditions which the government prescribes. If he lives under an absolute monarchy, he cannot get any official station, or any political power, at all, unless he will conform to the conditions prescribed by the will of the absolute monarch. If he lives in our many-headed despotism, which we call Democracy (leaving out the an), he is bound to conform to the conditions which the majority of the people prescribe, in the form which they have chosen; and he gets no political power, rightfully, legally and constitutionally, in any other way.

They had to deal with the thing just as it was. The Constitution says you shall not exercise any powers which belong to this

government unless you conform to its conditions. But the friend had said—not in these words, but, resolved into its elements, this was what he said—I have a right to govern you whether you are willing or not. I have a right to do all I can to be your President, although you utterly repudiate my sentiments. He could not admit any such principle. No one could rightfully do such without his consent. There was no such thing as freedom among a people where the majority had the right to say who should be the ruler, without any regard to the consent or the dissent of the minority. When we came together, therefore, in this governmental organization—which is the artificial thing which society is not—we came upon certain plainly expressed conditions; and one of these was, that every party to that government shall swear to support, directly or indirectly, a Constitution which requires the giving up of runaway slaves to their masters—a Constitution which requires the recognition of the right of the slave States to a representation based on slave-property—and so on through the whole range of the pro-slavery compromises of the Constitution.

It seemed to him, after all, that there was some little doubt as to whether they could, by remaining in the government, effect more good than by withdrawing from it and uttering their testimony against it. Until, therefore, his friend had established his theory of government, not merely as a beautiful ideal, which ought to be put in practice, but one that is recognized in this country, it seemed to him that his conclusion stood solely upon this basis—in order to do a great right, do a little wrong; or, at least, promise to do it, without meaning to keep the promise.

His friend had said in the course of his argument, that there was no danger of being misunderstood on this matter. Their position was clear and well-defined enough. He (Mr. B.) would venture to say that if he (Mr. W.) were to go through the ranks of the Free Soil party, and ask its members, man by man, to define the position of John P. Hale, or Salmon P. Chase, or Charles Sumner, on the character of the Constitution, he would be satisfied that the case was not quite so clear as he had supposed. He would venture to say that he (Mr. W.) would not get less than half as many distinct answers than he would address individuals.

We want something specific on this point, but his friend had dealt only in generalities. John P. Hale is decidedly Anti-Slavery in his feelings; Charles Sumner altogether on the side of Freedom and against Slavery. He supposed nobody doubted it; but that did not touch the question at issue. He remembered that some years ago, the Liberty Party nominated as a candidate for office a man who had made more sacrifice to the cause of freedom than Mr. Hale and Mr. Sumner together; and yet that man told him, in conversation, that he would not only promise to give back a runaway slave to his master, but he would keep the promise, for the sake of securing a place where he could exercise political power. Now he did not know what John P. Hale's sentiments were on this subject; but it might be that he agreed with the anti-slavery man to go into the business of slave-catching, in a certain case, for the sake of securing and using political power against Slavery. As he had not come to the conviction that he could tolerate and protect the slaveholder so far, even for the sake of office, he could not consent to be represented in the Presidency, or the Senate Chamber, or the House of Representatives, by men who occupied that position.

He did not say that Mr. Hale does regard the matter in that light; but could any man say he did not? Could any man say he was confident that Mr. Hale, or Goldings, or Sumner, or Chase, or any Free Soil man in Congress, would not, upon clear satisfaction given to a jury of twelve men, here in old Massachusetts, that a person claimed as a fugitive actually did run away from the slaveholder, who held him according to the statute book of a Southern State—did any man know that either of these distinguished gentlemen would refuse to give up that man, by State action or by some sort of action, to the pursuing claimant? He thought there was no one there who could say it. These men, it was well known, were scrupulous for securing the right of trial by jury, for alleged runaway slaves. But why should they ask for a jury trial to settle the question of ownership, if their decision was not to be executed? It was the sheerest mockery to call the jury together in such a case. The controversy of these gentlemen was not so much with the act of returning the fugitive, as with the mode of doing it.

Did not Mr. Sumner, in that great and eloquent speech of his, know that his readers would understand him, when he did not deny the obligation of the State to give up the runaway slave, as admitting that such a right does exist? All these men had admitted, that if the proof be made clear to the minds of a jury of twelve men, that if a fugitive was legally held as a slave, under the provisions of the Constitution, and escaped without his master's consent, then the slave must be given up. Let their friend keep this distinction clearly in his mind, between a general opposition to slavery, and a specific determination to do no single act whatever which is seen to have a bearing towards slavery.

His friend had said that he deems it exceedingly important to use this power, and not be withheld from its exercise by any nice scruples of conscience, or any mere punctilios of duty, because in no other way can we embody the anti-slavery opinion of the country into will and act. Here he dissented. He believed that slavery would be abolished in this country long before the Constitution was anti-slavery; that whereas, the pro-slavery character of the Constitution was not the cause but the effect of slavery, so the triumph of anti-slavery will not be the effect but the cause of a revolution in the Constitution also. The power of the anti-slavery agitation was such as to make the downfall of slavery morally certain, unless some other prop could be put under it other than that which the Constitution gives it. John C. Calhoun, though he claimed, as the constitutional powers of slavery, some things which the North does not concede, he clearly foresaw the surrender and downfall of slavery, under the force of that moral agitation which has shaken the four corners of the land by the power of speech.

Now, that was his (Mr. B.) faith. He fully agreed with John C. Calhoun, that the Constitution, pro-slavery as it is, cannot save slavery from destruction; that the power which is bearing against slavery is mightier,

not only than any thing in the Constitution, but mightier than any thing which John C. Calhoun could put into it.

His friend had said that it was every man's duty to vote, because thereby he could do something for the overthrow of slavery, and said, suppose we get the public sentiment on our side, there is still the law against us. But what was the law against the public opinion of the land? When the public sentiment had come to be decisively and earnestly on the side of freedom,—when they had men everywhere who stood up to the line, "No compromise with slavery—No Union with slaveholders,"—then they would see that the Constitution, if they attempted to wrench it round the horns of the slave was weaker than a rope of sand, and the Fugitive Slave Law more powerless than the rust which crumbled to fine powder last year; (loud cheers;) then they would see that it is vain for judges or legislators to attempt to keep a slave in his chains against the fiat of that public sentiment which says, "Stand fast in the liberty which God designs to give you." (Applause.)

His friend had made a supposition, that the ranks of the disunion abolitionists should increase until they were in the majority, and then asked how they would answer for it, if the time having come when their votes would give liberty to the slave, they refrained from exercising their right, and left the slave in the hands of those who would make his burdens heavier than before? If the time ever came that fire was kindled among the icebergs of Greenland and consumed them, without destroying every thing within its reach; if the time ever comes when the heaving gases shall burst from the volcano's throat, and pour no red tide upon the towns and cities below—what then? Why then the laws of nature would be reversed. (Laughter and applause.) And so, if the time ever came, that a vote cast into the ballot-box would be the turning weight between liberty and slavery, then the laws of moral action become altogether different from what they now are.

But suppose they had a majority of the people on their side, and yet the pro-slavery Constitution and the pro-slavery laws remained—what then? This majority would be made up of precisely those elements which are the most effective—the young men, just entering upon the duties and responsibilities of manhood—the women, from the girl at the district school up to the matron, watching the future rulers of the land. The politicians, as they well know, who were busy with the machinery of politics, with its chicanery, and quibbles and quips—would be the last persons to come into the anti-slavery ranks. Well, there was a man who refused to be a slave, and walked off into the free State lying nearest to him. How were they going to get him back? It took rather more than the ordinary force of the city of Boston, he believed, to take poor Thomas Sims out of the city as a slave; and yet, how very small a number of the citizens stood upon thorough anti-slavery ground! Had there been one full-grown man out of twenty in the city of Boston, at that time, they could no more have taken Thomas Sims—wouldn't you?—than "dismal Swamp," say, not so much; for the latter is possible, though not probable; but the former is neither probable nor possible. (Cheers.)

He had, however, been proceeding upon a supposition utterly impossible ever to be realized. Men were not converted to the true faith at once. As the anti-slavery faith was held up to the highest point of elevation, it would draw all men unto it. Some would come the whole way, some half way, some a quarter of the way—Gerrit Smith, John P. Hale, Charles Sumner leading them on.

In conclusion, Mr. Burleigh said he wished to say a few words in reference to a point which had been commented upon by some of the preceding speakers,—the position of men in Congress who claimed to be truly and decidedly anti-slavery. One of two things, it seemed to him, must be true: either the Constitution did tolerate slavery, did give the guarantees to the slave system which it was claimed that it did, or that Congress is no Congress at all. If it were true that the Constitution was thoroughly anti-slavery, if it were true that slaveholding was a violation of the law of the land—in plain English was a crime—then every slaveholder, under a just administration of that law, would be liable to be sent to the Penitentiary, rather than to Congress. He would not venture to say in which place he thought he would meet the more respectable company at present (laughter and cheers;) but his political position and influence might differ somewhat with the difference of his circumstances. If this theory is the correct one, the so-called Congress was no more a Congress than any assembly of bar-room bofers, nodding over glasses of whiskey or brandy; and every man who went there became a party to a monstrous lie. When Gerrit Smith goes up to Congress, he goes to become a member of a body which, on his own theory, has no existence; and recognizes as members of that body a clique of irresponsible men, who have no right to legislate for their country, and by whose acts the country is no more bound than the State of Pennsylvania would be bound by a vote that should be passed by that meeting.

His friend had said that we might tolerate some things which we did not recognize as right; that a representative in Congress might tolerate the presence of those there who were the representatives of slaves, with the express understanding that as soon as he could he would thrust them out. Let him say that to the officer appointed to administer the oath, and see if he would have an opportunity to take the oath! He would have no right to administer it, under such circumstances. If his friend could do this, and tolerate the legislation of a body of men claiming to be the Congress of the United States, and continue to recognize that as binding on us, then he was carrying toleration to an extent where "forbearance ceased to be a virtue," if it has not become something of a very different character. No man had a right to tolerate a class of men as legislators who had not the least shadow of authority to occupy legislative positions. It was a toleration fatal to the very principles of political freedom.

He came, then, to this conclusion: Government was artificial, and our right to take any part in it results from a compact and that compact based upon conditions, if conditions were prescribed. As a matter of fact, the conditions prescribed by this government were a certain measure of adherence with, and aid to the slave system. Therefore, as he, and those who believed with him,

could not accept those favors which government proposed to grant on these conditions, they adopted the motto, "No Union with slaveholders," turned from the ballot-box, and gave their votes there in the ears of the people, and abroad through the land in the publications of the press.

Stephen S. Foster, Samuel B. Blackwell, and W. L. Garrison continued the discussion. Wendell Phillips, Lucy Stone, Parker Pillsbury, John C. Clure, and others were among the speakers at the subsequent sessions. Additional resolutions were also adopted.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, JUNE 11, 1853.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE meets July 2.

What the Church is Doing.

The respectability and piety of the country has recently had its annual convocations in this country. We have watched them carefully to see what they were doing for humanity. They have given their annual contributions to the Bible, the tract, and the missionary Societies. But in doing this they have ignored the cause of the slave. They have thickened the "mint and annis and cummin," but have omitted the weightier matters of justice and humanity. One of their most marked acts, one that will make some figure in history, if infamy shall hereafter be worthy of record, was their insolent repulse of one half of the race, in the pure and peaceful effort to redeem the world from intemperance. It will be marked and remembered, too, that they did it in a style worthy the supporters of a system of woman whipping and of the wholesale system of southern prostitution, and in language befitting the frequenters of the brothel or the slave pen.

Some of the ecclesiastical organizations, proper, have also been in session, and have been most appropriately employed, especially the rival hunkers of the Presbyterian church. The Old School in Philadelphia, and the New School in Buffalo. This latter body passed resolutions in favor of colonization—recommending its agents to the benevolence of its church, expressing its sincere regret that France and Brazil, England, Prussia and Belgium, are before us, in recognizing the independence of Liberia.

On the important subject of dancing, they bear the following testimony:

"Resolved, That the fashionable amusement of promiscuous dancing is so entirely unscriptural and eminently and exclusively that of the 'world which lieth in wickedness,' and so wholly inconsistent with the spirit of Christ, and with that propriety of Christian deportment and that purity of heart which his followers are called to maintain, that we deem it improper and injurious for professing Christians either to partake in it, or to qualify their children for it by teaching them the art; but also to call for the faithful and judicious exercise of discipline on the part of church sessions, when any of the members of their churches have been guilty."

On the subjects of colonization and dancing there seems to have been the utmost harmony. But on the question of a man's marrying his own niece, there was some diversity. Dr. Cox reported that God had not forbidden the relation, but finally, after some discussion, and a pretty decided expression of the popular press in regard to this incestuous relation, they expressed their condemnation of it. The great agitating question, also, did they not escape.—The discussion was conducted with much warmth—was once gagged down, but finally with threats of disunion from both North and South, it was revived, and resulted in the following report:

I. That this body shall reaffirm the doctrine of the second resolution adopted by the General Assembly, convened in Detroit in 1850; and

II. That with an express disavowal of any intention to be impertinently inquisitorial, and for the sole purpose of arriving at the truth, so as to correct misapprehension and allay all causeless irritation, a committee be appointed of one from each of the synods of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and Virginia, who shall be requested to report to the next General Assembly on the following points:

1. The number of slaveholders in connection with the churches, and the number of slaves held by them;

2. The extent to which slaves are held from an unavoidable necessity imposed by the laws of the states, the obligations of guardianship and the demands of humanity.

3. Whether the southern churches regard the sacredness of the marriage relation as it exists among the slaves; whether baptism is only administered to the children of the slaves professing Christianity; and in general, to what extent and in what manner provision is made for the religious well-being of the enslaved.

III. That this assembly do earnestly exhort and beseech all those in our church who are happily relieved from any personal connection with the institution of slavery, to exercise due patience and forbearance toward their brethren less fortunate than themselves, remembering the embarrassment of their peculiar position, and to cherish for them that fraternal confidence and love to which, as Christian brethren, they are entitled, and which they are the more in need in consequence of the peculiar trials by which they are surrounded.

The following is the resolution adopted at Detroit, which is referred to in the above report:

"Resolved, That the holding of our fellow-men in the condition of slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable by the laws of the state, the obligations of guardianship or the demands of humanity, is an offence in the proper import of that term as used in the Book

of Discipline, chap. 1, sec. 3, and should be regarded and treated in the same manner as other offences."

It gives, as our readers will see, all the license that any Presbyterian can ask for slaveholding and church-fellowship.

We ought to state that the Assembly also resolved that church members must not travel on Sunday except to and from church, or on some errand of necessity. In the Tribune which has just come to hand, we find the following comment upon this action of the Assembly:

"Here is no general foray on all Slaveholders as transgressors nor on Slaveholding as necessarily sinful. The inquiries proposed looked, not to the extinction of Slaveholding in the Church, but rather to the correction of alleged abuses and the conformation of its details to the acknowledged and undeniable principles of Christian morality and Christian duty. The Report is apologetic and soothing with regard to Christian Slaveholding, which is not, like Christian Sabbath-breaking and Christian Dancing, denounced without qualification or circumspection as evil, but rather indicated as tending to evil and proffering temptation to abuse. Surely, a Church which provides against the very anomalous case of a man's marrying his niece has a right to inquire whether its members sell each other into the merciless clutches of Lowndes, and break their marriage unions as if they were the casual association of cattle. And as this inquiry into Southern Presbyterian worship must necessarily be entrusted to those most interested in whitening the outside of the sepulcher, there could be no rational doubt that the Report would be as apologetic and varnishing as truth could possibly allow."

"We cannot believe, then, that the Southern Presbyterians will be so maladroit as to plead guilty to this tender arraignment by seceding from the Assembly. They can do a great deal better, by acceding to the proposed inquiries and so conducting them that they will amount to nothing, or prove that the worst abuses of Slavery receive no countenance from and reflect no discredit upon the New School Presbyterians of the South. And this, we presume, will be the course, on reflection, adopted."

Important Announcement.

The announcement of Mr. Pillsbury will make thousands of freedom-loving hearts in the West, "leap for joy," in response to his own. Reports from every quarter make it sure that, never in the West, at least, were there as many listening ears, or as many hearts waiting for the truth, as now. To meet this exigency, the Ex. Committee of the Western Anti-Slavery Society contemplate vigorous efforts during the Fall. And their encouragement is great, in consequence of the interest taken by our co-laborers in this work. The noble-hearted

dollars for this work, must make up his mind to take a part of his reward in the payment of that "other five hundred," for any sort of feasible "plan," or anything like reasonable "measures" for creating anti-slavery sentiment in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan, cannot fail to succeed. This proposition, in connection with the noble contribution we announced last week, cannot fail to stimulate every abolitionist among us, to new labors and new liberality in the work. Come on Friends, let us make short work of this matter. What a shame that at this age scores of years should accomplish so little against so manifest a wrong. With us it is left to say whether it shall so continue. The two friends to whom we have alluded, are evidently hastening the consummation. This is not less the way of economy of money and of labor, than of humanity. Of course we, for very shame, if not for love, will work and pray with new zeal, and let us hope, with new wisdom and success.

Mr. Pillsbury's letter came to hand last week, but too late for insertion in our last.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BALLOT-BOX.—We have just laid down Horace Mann's article in the Liberator, on the "Constitution and the Ballot-box." We have read it carefully. It is too long for us to print. It is based on the supposition that there is slavery and wrong in the Constitution. It is simply this, amplified through five columns, viz: "The object and purpose of the act determines its quality." No one may be Congressman, judge or marshal for the sake of supporting slavery, or returning a fugitive; but he may be either, for the sake of abolishing slavery and delivering the fugitive. This is the only argument that can be used.—Not a popular one in theory, especially when distinctly and definitely presented, but one of very general practice. Mr. Mann's whole argument depends upon the answers given the questions, which have long puzzled the world, and will probably long continue to divide it, whether it is a thing right because it is good in its results, or is it good because it is right?

Mr. Mann promises in another article, his views on the Constitution. JUSTICE NOT IMPOVERISHING.—The Tribune reports a conversation between the Editor and C. M. Clay, in which the latter says that when he emancipated his slaves, he did it with the expectation of great pecuniary loss to result therefrom. But in this he has been happily disappointed. He finds that the emancipation of his slaves has worked unexpectedly to his pecuniary advantage, by improving the products of his farm under free labor and rendering it a profit, and not as hitherto a loss to him.

THE N. Y. WOMEN'S STATE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY was held last week. It was numerously attended. Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Vaughn, Mrs. Bloomer, Miss Anthony, Miss Stone and Mrs. Brown were among the speakers. The Society has heretofore excluded men from membership, and a spirited discussion occurred upon rescinding this rule. It was finally laid on the table till the next annual meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Griffing in Warrensville.

WARRENSVILLE, June 4th, 1853.

DEAR FRIEND MARIUS: You will readily see that I am not much accustomed to writing, but my sympathies have just been roused up by our friends the Griffings. Not only for the oppressed slave of the South, but also for those who are chained down by political and sectarian dogmas at the North. We had a joyful time among us for a few days past. Last week, I fell in with Charles and Josephine Griffing, at Bainbridge. They were reconnoitering the old battle ground, picking up the bruised and wounded, who had skulked under the ruins and smoke of that old pulp, which you will recollect, O. O. Brown burnt last summer, and which the pro-slavery priests were so eager to charge upon Mr. Pillsbury and his anti-slavery associates. However that smoke has all blown away. And now Brown and the church, (I don't know whether it is proper to call it a church, as in numbers they don't vary much from a corporal's guard; but be they more or less,) they are now at issue in a court of chancery, in regard to the title. I secured the promise of the Griffings to visit us in Warrensville. They came. We had a good sized school house filled with starved, emaciated souls, starved not for bread and meat, but for the word of truth. They were refreshed, and besought our friends to come again, which they did after the Ravenna Convention, staying with us during the Holy Sabbath, preaching deliverance to the captive.

Friend Griffing presented the pro-slavery character of the constitution, and of the church, and showed the relation of the political parties to slavery, in such a manner as to convince every man and woman not drunk with sectarian religion and party politics. Sister Griffing's address in the forenoon on Sunday, ought to have convinced a nation, and it seemed to me it would, could she have got it ear. It was just what every city, town or neighborhood ought to hear.—We gathered thirteen subscribers to the Bugle, and we confidently believe we have not yet got half we shall get.

Our friends afterwards visited the centre of the town, where there are three meeting houses. The Disciples' house was obtained for their use. I presume they might have got either of the others, for they are sadly decaying for want of use, and very much racked for want of rumpers. The house was soon filled with another hungry audience. True they had been fed, but as usual, it was on psalms and hymns, doctrines and ordinances, until they had almost forgotten their suffering neighbor. And then all sorts of politics had been taught and practiced, till the love principle had become almost extinct.

Charles and Josephine took up the relation of master and slave, and the relation and influence of the church on slavery, which soon led off into an interesting discussion of the whole matter, both moral and political. These meetings were held with intense interest, till eleven or twelve o'clock, and then it seemed as if the people did not want to leave. Our friends I think have a happy way of entertaining an audience, and of explaining the whole matter.

Now Friend Robinson, we are in a destitute condition all through this region, fed as we have been on the husks of spiritual songs, or discourses, creeds and politics, which have served to obliterate humanity from the hearts of the people. They have humanity there, and it might be developed. We wish our friends the Griffings, could spend some weeks or months in this region. We ought to hold our anniversary in Cleveland. Its growing wealth and population, and influence, the facilities for getting there by steamboats and railroads, indicate it as an important centre of influence. We might do it if the country around was thoroughly aroused, and thus our whole region would render more efficient aid to the slave.

Yours sincerely,

H. POST.

New England Correspondence.

Boston, May, 27th, 1853.

DEAR MARIUS: We closed the New England Convention at ten o'clock last evening. It was a gathering that fully sustained the well earned reputation of former years. A most violent rain and an admittance fee, might have been supposed to operate to make our last meeting small in numbers. But far enough from this was the fact. The spacious house was filled, and not a whisper was heard in opposition to the most radical of our doctrines.

But my main object in writing at this moment is, to announce to you, that in consulting upon future operations, the West was not forgotten. And I think you will rejoice to learn that one of our wealthy men pledged a sum not less than one thousand dollars, and another five hundred, should the plans and measures succeed well, to be devoted wholly to the Western field. The interest I take in your labors and successes is such, as that you may be assured my heart leaped for joy, when I was authorized to make the announcement to the meeting. The proposition was received by the crowded audience with demonstrations of joy. And from conversation with several members of the American Executive Committee, I find it will meet their views, to make a strong demonstration the coming autumn, in your direction. I know how cheerfully your Board will co-operate in such a movement. You will, I doubt not, be addressed officially by the Executive Committee, without delay, and so I will say no more on the subject.

The signs of the Times are most encouraging. Let us take heart and labor on. Not long will the victory be delayed.

Yours and your Readers,
PARKER PILLSBURY.

ROBERT SEARS, PUBLISHER,
181 William Street, New-York